UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,085	10/11/2005	Shintaro Okada	09792909-6376	4769
26263 7590 04/14/2008 SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER			EXAMINER	
			SHIKHMAN, MAX	
CHICAGO, IL	•	STOWER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/553,085	OKADA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MAX SHIKHMAN	2624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 C	October 2005					
	s action is non-final.					
<i>,</i>	/ 					
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 October 2005</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
		•				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
·— ·— ·—	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
·						
<u> </u>						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/02/2007 10/11/2005</u> . 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because S2 & S12 use, "around", which implies pixels surround C as a rectangle. This conflicts with Fig 3 and spec P9 line 12, "adjoin in the horizontal direction". In S2 & S12, change "centered around" to --adjoin in the horizontal direction as in Fig 3--.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,085

Art Unit: 2624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Page 3

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 5,6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In Claim 5 change, "A recording medium having a program", to --A computer readable medium storing a program--.

In Claim 6 change, "A program", to -- A computer readable medium storing a program --.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2624

5. Claim 1 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No.

10/805207.

Claim 4 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of copending Application No.

10/805207.

Claim 5 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of copending Application No.

10/805207.

Claim 6 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of copending Application No.

10/805207.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

from each other because they disclose the same operation.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the

conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2624

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim **1,4,5,6**; **2,3** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiya PGPUB-DOCUMENT-NUMBER: 20010038716 in view of Nakajima, PGPUB-DOCUMENT-NUMBER: 20040008902.

() Regarding Claims 1,4,5,6:

(Note: signal of attention= x_n . predetermined threshold value= ε . weight= a_k)

1. A signal processing apparatus for adjusting levels of continuously arranged signals, said signal processing apparatus characterized by comprising:

designation means (5) for designating the continuously arranged signals as a signal of attention (x_n) one by one; (Formula 1: n)

determination means (5) for determining a predetermined number of signals preceding (Formula1: k=-N) the signal of attention designated by the designation means, and a predetermined number of signals following (Formula1: N) the signal of attention, to be neighbouring signals; (Formula1)

weight average means for averaging by weight ([0032]. Formula 1: a_k) the signal of attention and the plurality of neighbouring signals; ([0032]. Formula 1: w_{n-k})

flag setting means for calculating a difference in levels between the signal of attention and a neighbouring signal, (Formula1: $|x_n-x_{n-k}|$)

judging whether or not the difference (Formula1: $|x_n-x_{n-k}|>\varepsilon$) is larger than a predetermined threshold value, (ε) and raising flags (output of 33) for the neighbouring signal with respect to the signal of attention, when the difference is judged to be larger than the predetermined threshold value;

Art Unit: 2624

(Formula1: when $|x_n-x_{n-k}| > \varepsilon$, $w_{n-k}=x_n$.)

and control means (5) for controlling and causing the weighted average means to average by weight, (Formula1) using the signal of attention instead of the neighbouring signal ([0034] "ignoring the pixel value x_{n-k} ") for which the flag is raised. (output of 33)

Tsuchiya discloses everything as described above except, ¹and a neighbouring signal which are arranged symmetrically.

Nakajima discloses, [0034] "..."1" is output from the AND circuits 12 when both of absolute values of differences between level values of combined pixels and the watched pixel are smaller than the reference level". [0042] "using only pixels which are both selected and thereby performing the averaging operation, an averaged signal phase is not deviated from the original position of the watched pixel and moreover, the possibility that generated image edges are disordered can be canceled."

As Nakajima discloses, both pixels symmetric about a watched pixel are subtracted from the watched pixel; if the difference for either subtraction calculation is more then theta, both pixels are not used in the average. This allows for unchanging signal phase.

() Regarding Claim 2:

2. The signal processing apparatus as described in claim 1, characterized in that said flag setting means further raises a flag (Tsuchiya. output of 33. Nakajima's output of 11) for a neighboring pixel away, (Formula1: $|x_n-x_{n-k}| > \varepsilon$, k={-N...N}) in view of the pixel of attention, (x_n) from the neighboring pixels raised with flags.

Art Unit: 2624

() Regarding Claim 3:

3. The signal processing apparatus as described in claim 1, characterized in that

said signals are pixel values of pixels constituting an image. (Fig1. [0028] "pixel value")

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MAX SHIKHMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-

1669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-6:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, JINGGE WU can be reached on (571) 272-7429. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Max Shikhman 4.2.2008

/Jingge Wu/

Art Unit: 2624

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624